

Engagement Barriers and Solutions Brainstorm

KEY: @= priority sticker

GENERAL BARRIERS:

- Why people won't/choose not to enroll/wait to enroll?
- Ensure usage of asset based language with providers and families
- Complexity of the whole process makes it hard at the beginning (lots of questions) @
- Commitment of time and resources of staff (licensing on steroids)
- Need for additional staffing to engage
- Stories/folklore
- Fear of Change
- Lack of buy-in that EA is a good idea across the system (ex. Licensing & SEIU) @@@@
- Providers (EA) only offer standard business hours and families need extended hours, overnight, and weekend and want quality @
- There is little incentive or ROI for programs who serve predominantly private pay. Not able to take state subsidy because of low reimbursement rate @@@@
- Systems can work at cross purposes creating unintended consequences @
- Cuts in community services (ex. School transportation) can impact CC quality
- Immigration status can limit access to services (cultural understanding of CC) @@
- Cultural/linguistic responsiveness must be recognized as an asset accordingly on ratings @
- How are parents being cultivated as partners in early learning? @

IDEAS for Lack of buy-in that EA is a good idea across the system (ex. Licensing & SEIU) @@@@

- Provide a costing of the providers supports provided so they can see the value. Ex: coach costs \$xx.xx, scholarship support= \$xx.xx, etc.
- Create a process within DEL to create clarity around roles and responsibilities of everyone working at DEL re: Early Achievers. Everyone owns its success.
- Public campaign around quality childcare and Early Achievers and what it means.
- Convene community education opportunities to share information (at schools, policy councils, and places where parents congregate)
- Engage with Children's Alliance, Moms Rising, Parent Map, Fight Crime/Invest in Kids to diversify the voice around the value of Early Achievers (create messaging they can use)
- Licensors (when doing regular licensing visit, licensing checklist) should explain EA and encourage participation (especially when serving subsidized children, due to August 1<sup>st</sup> deadline). This should be a required element and should be expected in performance management of licensors.
- 

ENROLLMENT:

- Transparency and navigation (language specific) for parents
- "What is EA?" Parents don't know. (Parents are the consumer/ they should be made aware of EA and how it can impact their child) @
  - Maybe video in different languages explaining what it is in accessible language, not jargon
- Recruit and engage low income, diverse providers @@@
  - Funding pool to small community-based orgs/groups to do outreach in safe, trusted

spaces that are culturally/linguistically relevant @@@

- Licenser involvement to get the word out
- Mixed messages—rumors—fact vs. fiction
- Invited—what next?
- Providers who don't want to change their practice, think they are already excellent. Don't want outsiders in program.
- Lack of community relationships and collaborations
- Creating awareness and desire families to request/use quality info/engagement of providers as part of their decision-making process
- Flexibility in programs/services to meet needs of families @@@

IDEAS for Recruit and engage low income, diverse providers @@@

- Funding pool to small community-based orgs/groups to do outreach in safe, trusted spaces that are culturally/linguistically relevant @@@
- Need to be able to explain EA at enrollment stage in a way that is not overly complex/confusing
- Translation—should be not only the literal translation but also translating the technical terms of Early Achievers and what it is trying to achieve and what is expected.
- Need trusted messengers—and these folks need to get the necessary info about EA. How do we find them? (individuals, neighborhood connections, providers)
- Messaging that engages the why in a way that speaks to what is meaningful to them
- More strategic partnership w/ licensing, especially newly licensed programs. Identify providers who would be good with EA, provide them with information about available resources
- Mobilize provider to provider relationships
- Intentional outreach/re-engagement of providers who stall out

LEVEL 2 BARRIERS

- Supporting materials for rating assessment only available in English (proprietary) @
- Language—examples only English
- Connectivity—internet access
- Time—work 12 hour day @
- Volume of things—licensing, EA, education, ECEAP, Head Start
- Computer literacy—MERIT. Computer access is an issue. Online training could be in person training. @@
- Relationship development—language types of providers, Montessori, other philosophies
- Business sustainability—wages, time paid for training, rebate time/\$
- MERIT as a database—bugs
- Support basic policy and practice/paperwork.
- Start with self-assessment
- Use templates—file support materials
- Specific alignment of staff roles and qualifications can be an imposition on how a center would otherwise assign staff.
- Professional development toward requirements takes significant time and funds as well as motivation
- How is access to PD \$\$ being done? Do non-native English speaking providers know about these opportunities? How is this population being included? @
- Are there enough needs-based grants? Ran out very fast last round. @

IDEAS for Computer literacy—MERIT. Computer access is an issue. Online training could be in person training. @@

- Develop or pilot an integrated digital learning model; i.e. I-BEST or English Innovations
- Integrated Learning is a WA State innovation that simultaneously develops literacy and technical skills; EA/Early Learning is a ripe field for this innovative strategy to address this issue.
- There are some generational challenges with this—libraries have been helpful.
- Building a cohort group where they can help each other is a good way to cultivate support

#### RESOURCES

- Language and translated materials/guides. Released at the same time as English materials @@
- Are guides and applications using accessible language or jargon?
- Multiple modes of delivery for materials! (videos, visuals, hands on, audio, etc.)
- Sorting through materials to find what is relevant
- Distance from early learning resources—not in town or neighborhood or low quality
- Being with self-assessment and determine what you really need
- Build templates for file of supporting materials. Many TAs have them—time to pull together
- Build templates for family support
- Are there guides or templates for successful rerate?
- Utilize all avenues to spread the word about EA (DOH, DSHS, FB, Twitter, Mailings)

#### DATA SYSTEMS (MERIT, WELS, etc.)

- WELS data accessibility/reports @
- Disaggregated data—provider language
- Systems aren't flexible/cant adapt to program changes @@@@
- Educator applications need to prompt support in MERIT
- Reports are only available in English
- MERIT facility data should inform licensing
- System bugs and unresponsive fixes or long delays
- MERIT in multiple languages
- MERIT doesn't collect/require demographic info
- MERIT only in English
- Facility needs thorough feedback from data collected @

#### RATING

- Lack of information and support prior to 1<sup>st</sup> rating leads to disappointment on how scores reflect quality. Specific details like choice of assessment tools can lack guidance at the time of implementation and then not count
- Limited days of implementation of new policy that fulfils EA—30 days
- The point spread in level 3 is too broad (39 pts), level 4 (20 pts), level 5 (9 pts). Needs to change! @@@@
- Applicability of standards/assessments to FCC settings @
- Concerns re: cultural/linguistic relevance of some standards
- U of WA presentation accessible
- Experience varies depending on when program goes through/ enters process/ pipeline
- Time delay until results are available, send directly @
- Multi-System/Blended Programs (ECEAP/HS/ECLIPSE/CC/etc.)
- Language
- Fear of unknown
- Quality control—what if rater is in error?
- Rumors
- Unreasonable expectations around level of rating. Should score higher across the board. @

- Rerate process is confusing (pay structure) (new one is ready!)
- Rating data reports only in English
- Accuracy of translated materials (e.g. level of translation)
- Not enough weight given to programs that serve children in Home language. Need to incentivize programs that provide diverse and appropriate supports to at risk communities. @@@@

IDEAS for The point spread in level 3 is too broad (39 pts), level 4 (20 pts), level 5 (9 pts). Needs to change! @@@@

- Level 5 (currently 91-100) Propose: 81-100
- Level 4 (currently 70-90) Propose: 56-80
- Level 3 (currently 30-69) Propose: 30-55
- Consider ERS point spread
- More flexibility with larger point spread
- Additional possible points—acknowledge unique attributes
- Extra credit/points/recognition for Areas of Specialization
- Look at other factors that influence child outcomes that we've not yet acknowledged
- Need a paragraph description or different analogy—like bronze, silver, gold because level three is still hard to attain and represents an accomplishment.
- Making 4 more attainable would make folks drive toward that more—if they don't think they are going to make it to 70, they may not try for 60 because all they need is 30.